

the Government lapses into inefficiency and corruption. Brooklyn men admit these things.

In case of consolidation New-York could not expect any gain in its resources from the communities that are now beyond its limits, but, on the contrary, it would contribute largely to their support and improvement. Brooklyn would get the full benefit, and probably more than the full benefit, of the contributions which its own residents make to the resources of New-York. To the common treasury the property of this city would furnish much more than would be expended within its own area. It would help to give Brooklyn improved streets and better Police and Fire Departments, of which it is sadly in need, and it would extend its waterfront improvements to the other side of the river. Almost certainly its rate of taxation would be increased, while its own people would be no better off, except in sharing in whatever impulse might be given to the growth and prosperity of the great metropolis by obliterating existing divisions and barriers. If New-York is willing to make the immediate sacrifices that would result, Brooklyn ought to be grateful for the benefits that would accrue to her.

But the pending bill would not of itself bring about consolidation. It only provides for taking a vote of the people on the question. We see no reason why the Brooklyn politicians should object to that unless they are afraid that the people of that city are in favor of taking away their present occupation and that they would be reduced to insignificance in the Government of the greater New-York. Their representatives at Albany yesterday professed a willingness to withdraw their opposition to the pending bill if it was so amended as to leave out of the greater city any municipality or town whose separate vote should be against the consolidation. This seems to indicate confidence that they could keep Brooklyn out, but it is probably intended to divide the supporters of the bill and help to defeat it. It is not likely that Brooklyn would vote against annexation, but it would be hardly advisable to take in Long Island City and Coney Island without the City of Churches. At all events, the best plan is to take the vote and see what the result will be, and then the question whether the consolidation shall be effected or not will become a practical one and more easy to deal with.

---

---

#### THE "GREATER NEW-YORK" BILL.

It is a significant fact that the large delegation which appeared before the Cities Committee yesterday at Albany in support of the "Greater New-York" bill was made up almost wholly of representatives of the people of Brooklyn, and that the only opposition came from one or two politicians of that city. The City of New-York was only represented by two members of the Consolidation Commission. It seems to be generally assumed that the people of this city do not object to the consolidation, though they have shown no very enthusiastic interest in it one way or the other. Their support is very likely to be inspired mainly by what Senator McCARREN was disposed to ridicule as "mere sentiment" in favor of establishing a big municipality at the great seaport of the American continent, which shall be a rival in extent and population of the metropolis of the Old World. But if on account of this sentiment they are willing to take Brooklyn and the surrounding country into a full share of the common heritage, it is for the people thus favored to rejoice and be grateful.

It is not without reason that the chief interest in this project has appeared in Brooklyn, for it is that town which would get the greatest practical benefit. A large proportion of those who reside at the other end of the bridge and of the East River ferries have business and property interests in New-York. Their busy hours are spent in this city, and their labor and capital contribute to its resources and its prosperity, while their nights and Sundays are spent on the other side of the river. Though they may vote and pay taxes in Brooklyn, they contribute more largely for the support of a Government under which they do not live, and from which in their place of residence they derive no benefit. One consequence is that the rate of taxation upon property in Brooklyn is abnormally high, while the revenues are insufficient to give the city a decent Government, if they are honestly applied. Its streets are badly paved and lighted, and disgracefully lacking in cleanliness, its public works are in a backward state, and its waterfront is in private hands. Citizens whose chief financial and business interests are on this side of the river are not disposed to exert themselves very zealously in behalf of municipal improvement on the other side, and